## REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the notification of allowable subject matter, i.e. that claims 10, 15 and 16 would be allowable if written in independent form.

Claims 1-20 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 21-40 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the new claims. For instance, support for the new claims appears e.g. in the original claims of the application.

Claims 1, 9, 13, 14 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Kawabe et al. (JP 11-327145). The rejection is traversed.

The pending claims include a total of three independent claims: claims 21, 26 and 32. Claim 21 recites subject matter of former claim 9, which former claim was indicated to be allowable. Claim 26 recites subject matter of former claim 15, which former claim also was indicated to be allowable.

Claim 32 calls for a polymer that comprises at least three distinct repeat units and one or more Si atoms. Such a polymer is not taught or suggested by Kawabe.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 14, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Kawamura et al. (EP 0814381).

Claims 1-5, 8, 14, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Mizutani (JP 2001-201855).

Kanagasabapathy et al. U.S.S.N. 10/690,835 Page 7

Claims 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Kawabe et al. (JP 11-327145) in

view of Park (U.S. Patent 5759755).

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Mizutani (JP 2001-201855).

For the sake of brevity, the remaining four rejections are addressed in combination. Each

of the rejections are traversed.

As discussed above, the pending claims include a total of three independent claims:

claims 21, 26 and 32. Claim 21 recites subject matter of former claim 9, which former claim was

indicated to be allowable. Claim 26 recites subject matter of former claim 15, which former

claim also was indicated to be allowable.

Claim 32 recites subject matter of former claim 13, which former claim was not rejected

in view of Kawamura et al., Mizutani, or Kawabe et al. in view of Park.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

It is believed that the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is

earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, MA 02205

(617) 439-4444